

Amendments to the Drawings

The attached replacement sheets of drawings include FIGS. 1 to 5. These sheets replace the original sheets including FIGS. 1 to 5. These drawing amendments have been filed in response to the objection to the drawings in item 5 of the Office Action. As can be seen in the enclosed annotated sheets for FIGS. 2a and 2b, the six-digit numerals have been removed. Considering these drawing amendments are editorial in nature, no new matter has been added.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

Remarks

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 8 and 12 have been canceled without prejudice, and their features have been incorporated into amended independent claim 1. Independent claim 20 has been amended to incorporate the features of claim 17. Claims 4, 13, 14, and 15 have been amended to obviate any antecedent basis issues. Given that these amendments are editorial in nature, it is believed that these claim amendments are supported by the originally filed application. In addition, claims 22-28 have been added. It is likewise believed that these new claims are supported by the application as originally filed. For example, support for claims 22 and 27 can be found on page 10 as well as in FIGS. 3a-3b of the originally filed application (not referring to the substitute specification). As another example, support for claims 23-24 can be found on pages 10-11 as well as in FIGS. 4-5. In still yet another example, support for claims 26 and 28 can be found on pages 8-10 as well as FIGS. 1-3 of the originally filed application. As a result of these amendments, claims 1-7, 9-11, and 13-28 are currently pending and under consideration.

SUBSTITUTE SPECIFICATION

In item 1 of the Office Action, the disclosure was objected to “for the following informalities: the specification lacks proper headings.” The specification (except the claims) and abstract have been reviewed and revised to make several editorial revisions. Due to the number of changes involved, a substitute specification and abstract have been prepared and are submitted with this amendment. No new matter has been added. Enclosed is a marked-up copy of the original specification (without the claims) and abstract indicating the same changes incorporated into the substitute specification. It is submitted to be apparent from a consideration of such copy that entry of the substitute specification would simplify processing of the application. Considering that these amendments to the specification and abstract are editorial in nature, it is submitted that no new matter has been added. It is believed that the objections cited in item 1 have been remedied in the enclosed substitute specification.

DRAWING AMENDMENTS

The drawings were objected to in item 2 of the Office Action “because of the notations and the other numerals (6-digits) that appear to be a part of a design spec.” As a result, formal replacement drawings have been included in this response. These sheets replace the original sheets including FIGS. 1 to 5. As can be seen in the enclosed annotated sheets for FIGS. 2a and 2b, the six-digit numerals have been removed. Considering these drawing amendments are editorial in nature, no new matter has been added.

INDEPENDENT CLAIM 1

In item 4 of the Office Action, independent claim 1 was “rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Miyamoto et al.” Independent claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the features of claims 8 and 12, and it is believed that claim 1, as currently amended, is allowable over the references of record. For example, Miyamoto fails to disclose or suggest “scrolling actuation means for allowing user actuated movement of at least one of said first and/or second members, and wherein the scrolling actuation means are connected either directly or indirectly via mechanical connection means to said first locking member and movement of said scrolling actuation means results in recti-linear movement of said first locking member” as is now recited in claim 1.

Such a feature provides numerous advantages. For example, in the FIG. 4 embodiment of the present application, the actuation means is in the form of a lever arm (102) that moves a jigsaw (6) between one or more cutting modes and a scrolling mode. As discussed on page 11, the lever arm (102) is connected to a first locking member, which in the illustrated embodiment is in the form of a locking pin (104), via linkage arrangement (106), such that rotation of a lever arm (102) causes linear movement of the locking pin (104). A second locking member, which in the depicted embodiment is in the form of a rotatable knob (114), is provided on top of jigsaw (6) for rotation by the user during the scrolling operation. When the jigsaw is in a normal cutting mode (i.e. not a scrolling mode), a recess (124) in the knob (114) is engaged with the free end (128) of the locking pin (104) to lock the rotatable knob (114) in position. To convert the jigsaw to the scrolling operational mode, the lever arm (102) is rotated such that the locking pin (104) is removed in a linear manner out of the recess in the knob (114), thereby allowing the user to freely turn the knob (114). As should be recognized from reviewing pages 10-11 as well as FIG.

4 of the present application, the recited scrolling actuation means allows the user to quickly and easily switch between a scrolling and non-scrolling mode of operation without the need for the operator placing their hands near a potentially dangerous saw blade.

Miyamoto clearly does not disclose the scrolling actuation means recited in claim 1. Instead of using a scrolling actuation means, Miyamoto requires the operator to place their hands in close proximity to the fret-saw blade 26. Looking at FIGS. 8A and 8B of Miyamoto, the holder 37 has a series of recesses 34b that are engaged with a pair of ball 45 in a shaft portion 37a that are biased by a coil spring 44. As the operator grips and rotates the holder 37, the balls 45 engage and disengage from the recesses 34b in an alternating manner. Instead of the coil spring 44 and balls 45, the holder 37 in the FIG. 9 embodiment of Miyamoto incorporates an elastic member 46. Neither embodiment in Miyamoto utilizes a scrolling actuation means, let alone discloses a scrolling actuation means that moves a locking member in the rectilinear manner recited in claim 1. For these and other reasons, it is believed that claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable over Miyamoto.

INDEPENDENT CLAIM 20

In item 4, independent claim 20 was “rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Miyamoto et al.” In the present response, independent claim 20 has been amended to incorporate the features recited in claim 17, and it is believed that claim 20 is allowable over the references of record. For instance, Miyamoto fails to disclose or suggest “wherein said clamping members are pivotally mounted in said apparatus for radial movement with respect to the longitudinal axis of said apparatus between clamped and unclamped positions” as is now recited in claim 20. The rolling members 42 in Miyamoto are not pivotally mounted in the holder unit 36 and thus are not capable of radial movement. Rather, as depicted in FIG. 5, the rolling members 42 are fitted in linear slits 40a that are formed in the nip members 40 such that the rolling members 42 are only capable of moving in a linear fashion during clamping and unclamping of the holder unit 36. Considering that Miyamoto fails to disclose or suggest all of the features recited in claim 20, independent claim 20 and its dependent claim are allowable over Miyamoto.

In addition to the reasons given above for the patentability of independent claim 20, additional reasons support the allowance of its dependent claim 22. For instance, Miyamoto fails

to disclose or suggest “a blade clamped in the clamping apparatus, the blade having a protruding portion located in the aperture for further clamping the blade” as recited in claim 22. As discussed on page 10 and illustrated in FIGS. 3a-3b of the present application, the aperture (59) in the clamping mechanism in conjunction with the protruding portion (60) of the blade (4) helps to ensure that the blade (4) is firmly secured. It should be easily recognized that Miyamoto clearly does not disclose the aperture and protruding portion recited in claim 22. For these and other reasons, it is believed that claim 22 is allowable over the references of record.

INDEPENDENT CLAIM 23

It is believed that new independent claim 23 is allowable over the references of record. For instance, Miyamoto fails to disclose or suggest “a user actuation mechanism coupled to the locking pin, the user actuation member being configured to be actuated by a user to move the locking pin between a locked position where the locking pin engages the recess of the second locking mechanism and a unlocked position where the locking pin disengages from the recess to scrolling movement of the saw blade” as is recited in claim 23. Instead of using such combination of a user actuation mechanism, locking pin, and recess in a scrolling mechanism, the holder 37 in Miyamoto uses either a ball-spring 45, 44 or an elastic member 46 to release and hold the fret saw during rotation. For these and other reasons, it is believed that claim 23 and its dependent claims are allowable over the references of record.

INDEPENDENT CLAIM 26

It is also submitted that new independent claim 26 is allowable over the references of record. For example, it should be easily recognized that Miyamoto fails to disclose or suggest the recited wedge shaped clamping members as well as the recited intermediate member with the protrusion portion engaged with the recess portions in the clamping members. Looking at FIG. 4 of Miyamoto, the rolling members 42 are clearly not shaped like the clamping members recited in claim 26. Moreover, the holder unit 36 completely lacks any component that corresponds to the recited intermediate member. For these and other reasons, independent claim 26 and its dependent claims are allowable over the references of record.

CONCLUSION

It should be understood that the above remarks are not intended to provide an exhaustive basis for patentability or concede the basis for the rejections in the Office Action, but are simply provided to overcome the rejections made in the Office Action in the most expedient fashion.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and an early notice of allowance is earnestly solicited. If after reviewing this amendment the Examiner feels that any issues remain which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative by telephone to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Charles P. Schmal #45,082/
Charles P. Schmal, Reg. No. 45082
Woodard, Emhardt, Moriarty, McNett & Henry LLP
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3700
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-5137
(317) 634-3456